		Case 3:07-cv-02940-SI	Document 82	Filed 01/29/2008	Page 1 of 3
SAN FRANCISCO	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	NORTHERN DIS		297) 215501) 4) )  CS DISTRICT COURT RICT OF CALIFORNI CISCO DIVISION  Case No. C 07-0294  OPPOSITION OF CONNETICS COR LINCOLN KROCH VONTZ, AND THO	DEFENDANTS P., JOHN L. HIGGINS, HMAL, C. GREGORY DMAS G. WIGGANS TO "S REQUEST FOR NOTICE OF
	23				
	24				
	25				
	26				
	27				
	28				
		OPPOSITION TO LEAD PLAIN TO FILE NOT. OF SUPP. AUTH			CASE NO. C 07-02940 SI

The Court should deny Plaintiff's Request for Leave to File Notice of Supplemental
Authority because plaintiff has violated the clear terms of Civil Local Rule 7-3(d). That Rule
provides that a party must provide a citation to "the new opinion – without argument." See Civ.
L.R. 7-3(d) (emphasis added). Plaintiff's three-page analysis of the judicial opinion that it seeks
leave to bring to the Court's attention does not meet the "without argument" requirement. In fact,
plaintiff reargues the very issues that it addressed in its 40 page opposition memorandum and
during its one hour oral argument. See Plaintiff's Notice of Supplemental Authority at 1-3.
Because plaintiff improperly attempts to use its notice of supplemental authority as an
opportunity to continue arguing its case, the Court should deny plaintiff's motion. The Connetics
Defendants do not object to plaintiff seeking leave to file a notice of supplemental authority that
complies with Civil Local Rule 7-3(d). However, plaintiff has not filed such a notice to date. <sup>1</sup>
Detect: January 20, 2009 FENWICK & WEST LLD

Dated: January 29, 2008 FENWICK & WEST LLP

By: /s/
Emily St. John Cohen

Attorneys for Defendants Connetics Corp., John L. Higgins, Lincoln Krochmal, C. Gregory Vontz, and Thomas G. Wiggans

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In any event, plaintiff has mischaracterized the relevance of the authority it cites. The complaint at issue here is very different than the complaint at issue in Makor Issues & Rights Ltd. v. Tellabs Inc., 2008 U.S. App. LEXIS 975 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. Jan. 17, 2008). In the event that the Court would like further argument on that point, the Connetics Defendants are prepared to file a supplemental memorandum of law.

1 2

The undersigned declares as follows:

4

3

5

6 7

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

FENWICK & WEST LLP

15

17

16

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

OPPOSITION TO LEAD PLAINTIFF'S REQ.

## PROOF OF SERVICE

I am a citizen of the United States and employed in San Francisco County, State of California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within-entitled action. My business address is Fenwick & West LLP, San Francisco California, 555 California Street, 12th Floor San Francisco, California 94104. On the date set forth below, I served a copy of the following document(s):

OPPOSITION OF DEFENDANTS CONNETICS CORP., JOHN L. HIGGINS, LINCOLN KROCHMAL, C. GREGORY VONTZ, AND THOMAS G. WIGGANS TO LEAD PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY

on the interested parties in the subject action by placing a true copy thereof as indicated below, addressed as follows:

> Victor E. Zak 24 Oakmont Road Newton Center, MA 02459

**BY US MAIL:** by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope for collection and mailing following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with our ordinary business practices for collecting and processing mail for the United States Postal Service, and mail that I place for collection and processing is regularly deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day with postage prepaid.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United States that the above is true and correct.

Date: January 29, 2008 /s/ Carol Galvin

Carol Galvin

TO FILE NOT. OF SUPP. AUTHORITY

3